

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
WESTERN DIVISION**

---

RICKY RICARDO SMITH,

Plaintiff,

v.

VIRGINIA M. ALEXANDER, JANEEN R.  
GORDON, and ROBERT DUCK,

Defendants.

---

)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

No. 2:24-cv-02302-SHL-cgc

---

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION AND  
DISMISSING CLAIMS AGAINST DEFENDANTS**

---

Before the Court is Magistrate Judge Charmiane G. Claxton’s Report and Recommendation (“R&R”), entered on July 10, 2024, recommending that the Court dismiss all of pro se Plaintiff Ricky Ricardo Smith’s claims against Defendants for violations of 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (ECF No. 7.)

A magistrate judge may submit to a district court judge proposed findings of fact and recommendations that assist in the determination of certain pretrial matters. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A)–(B). Parties can file objections to the proposed findings and recommendations “[w]ithin 14 days after being served with a copy of the recommended disposition.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2); see also 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). A district court reviews de novo only those proposed findings of fact or conclusions of law to which a party specifically objects; the rest are reviewed for clear error. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). “When no timely objection is filed, the court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) advisory committee notes.

More than fourteen days have now passed since the R&R was entered, and Smith has failed to file any objections to the R&R. Since no objections have been filed, the Court reviews

the R&R in its entirety for clear error and finds none. Therefore, the Court **ADOPTS** the Magistrate Judge's R&R and **DISMISSES** Smith's claims.

**IT IS SO ORDERED**, this 6th day of August, 2024.

s/ Sheryl H. Lipman  
SHERYL H. LIPMAN  
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE